| # | Paper | Age | Sex | Hand. | Location | Side | Delay | Other speech disorders | Other symptoms | Lesion type |
|----|----------------------|-----|-----|-------|--|------|-------------------------|----------------------------------|---|------------------|
| I | Ardila 1986 | 50 | М | R | Temporal lobe | R | "After the recovery" | Speaking difficulty | L hemiparesis | lschaemic stroke |
| 2 | Soroker 1990 | 65 | М | R | Internal capsula, putamen, periventricular white matter | R | 2 weeks | - | L hemiparesis | lschaemic stroke |
| 3 | Abe 1993 | 38 | М | - | Thalamus, midbrain | Bil | < 3 months | - | Tetraparesis, apathy, gaze palsy | Ischaemic stroke |
| 4 | Grant 1999 Case I | 68 | М | R | Frontotemporoparietal region | L | No delay | Dysarthria | R hemiparesis | lschaemic stroke |
| 5 | Grant 1999 Case 4 | 55 | М | R | Occipital lobe | L | < 2 weeks | - | R hemianopia | lschaemic stroke |
| 6 | Carluer 2000 | 58 | М | R | Striatum | L | Weeks | Transient aphasia | R hemiparesis and parkinsonism | lschaemic stroke |
| 7 | Ciabarra 2000 Case I | 53 | М | R | Rostromedial pons | L | No delay | Dysarthria | Vertigo, ataxia, L INO, L facial droop, jaw tremor | lschaemic stroke |
| 8 | Ciabarra 2000 Case 2 | 54 | F | R | Putamen, caudate, corona radiata | L | No delay | Dysarthria | R facial droop, slowness of right finger movements | lschaemic stroke |
| 9 | Ciabarra 2000 Case 3 | 63 | F | L | Corona radiata, putamen, subinsular | L | No delay | Difficulty finding words | Reduced vision, R hemiparesis | lschaemic stroke |
| 10 | Turgut 2002 | 61 | М | R | Parietal cortex | L | No delay | - | R hemiparesis | lschaemic stroke |
| 11 | Doi 2003 | 60 | Μ | - | Midbrain, pons | Bil | No delay | Dysarthria | Vertigo, ataxia, gaze palsy | lschaemic stroke |
| 12 | Van Borsel 2003 | 38 | Μ | R | Thalamus | L | < 6 months | Aphasia | R hemiparesis | lschaemic stroke |
| 13 | Kakishita 2004 | 51 | Μ | R | Corpus callosum | R | No delay | - | - | lschaemic stroke |
| 14 | Hamano 2005 | 77 | F | R | Corpus callosum | Mid | No delay | - | Dizziness, nausea | lschaemic stroke |
| 15 | Sahin 2005 Case I | 65 | F | R | Parietal lobe | L | 2 days | Transient disability to speak | R hemiparesis | lschaemic stroke |
| 16 | Osawa 2006 | 51 | М | R | Tempo-parieto-occipital | L | < 2 days | Wernicke's aphasia | Homonymous hemianopsia, apraxia | lschaemic stroke |
| 17 | Karakis 2008 | 51 | F | R | Midbrain | Mid | l week | Dysarthria | Gaze palsy, ataxia | lschaemic stroke |
| 18 | Tani 2011 Casa I | 49 | М | Α | Putamen | Bil | days | Anomic aphasia, | R hemiparesis | Haemorrhage |
| 19 | Tani 2011 Case 2 | 16 | М | R | Putamen, globus pallidus | Bil | 6 months | Dysarthria | Ataxia | Trauma |
| 20 | Van Houtte 2014 | 28 | F | R | Temporal lobe | L | days | - | Transient linguistic disturbances | Haemorrhage |

Supplementary Table 1. Overview of case reports with acquired neurogenic stuttering in the literature cohort

Lesion location is listed according to the description in the original case report. A = ambidextrous, Bil = bilateral, F = female, Hand = Handedness, INO = internuclear ophtalmoplegia, L = left, M= male, Mid=Midline, R = right, - = Not reported.

Supplementary Table 2. Demographics of the cases in the acquired and developmental stuttering datasets

| | Neurogenic stuttering – literature cohort | Controls – literature cohort | Neurogenic stuttering - clinical cohort | Controls – clinical cohort | Developmental stuttering cohort |
|--|--|---|--|---|--|
| Ν | 20 | 169 | 20 | 17 | 20 |
| Age (median [range]) | 53 [16-77] | 69 [27-92] | 72 [45-87] | 69 [50-83] | 53 [18-43] |
| Sex (M/F) | 14/6 | 105/64 | 13/7 | 11/6 | 14/6 |
| Handedness | 13R, 1A, 6L | 106R, 6L ¹ | 20R | 17R, 3L | 15R, 4A, 1L |
| Aetiology (n [%]) | 17 [85%] infarcts, 3 [15%] haemorrhages | 139 [87%] infarcts, 16 [10%] haemorrhages, 5 [3%] both ² | 18 [90%] infarcts, 2 [10%] haemorrhages | 15 [88%] infarcts, I [12%] haemorrhage | N/A |
| % stuttered disfluencies during conversation (median [range]) ³ | | 5 [5%] 5641 | 4.5 [I.8-I9.4] ⁴ | 1.5 [0.3-2.6] | 4.5 [0.9-35.2] |
| % stuttered disfluencies during monologue (median [range]) | | | 4.4 [I.8-10.9] ⁵ | 1.0 [0.0-2.7] | |
| % stuttered disfluencies during reading (median [range]) | | | 3.0 [0.0-13.0] ⁶ | 0.5 [0.0-2.3] | |
| OASES score (median [range]) Impact (median [range]) | | | | | 2.5 [1.5-3.5] moderate [mild/moderate – |
| Aphasia | 4/11 (36%) | | 14/20 (70%) | 10/154 (67%) | moderate/severej |
| Anomia | 1/11 (9%) | | 13/20 (65%) | 9/17 (53%) | |
| Dysarthria | 7/11 (64%) | | 9/20 (45%) | 4/17 (24%) | |
| Apraxia of speech | | | 5/20 (25%) | 2/17 (12%) | |

¹57 missing values ²9 missing values

³For the clinical cohort, interrater reliability was measured by rescoring of 25% of conversation samples (N = 10) by a trained second observer. The percentage of stuttered disfluencies was strongly correlated between the two raters (r_s =0.82, P<0.01).³⁴ For the developmental stuttering cohort, rescoring of 50% of conversation samples (N = 10) by a trained second speech therapist with expertise in stuttering showed a very strong correlation (r_s =0.99, P<0.01).

⁴The information from the clinical cohort has been published previously.³⁴ While the range of disfluencies across the various speech tasks may be broader, all participants were identified with acquired neurogenic stuttering if they presented with more than 3% stuttered disfluencies during at least one of the included speech tasks.

⁵7 missing values

⁶3 missing values

⁷2 missing values

R = right, A = ambidextrous, L = left, OASES = Overall Assessment of the Speaker's Experience of Stuttering³⁵

| Cluster Index | Voxels (N) | P Value | COG X (mm) | COG Y (mm) | COG Z (mm) | COG region | | | |
|-----------------------|------------|---------|------------|------------|------------|----------------------------|--|--|--|
| Positive Associations | | | | | | | | | |
| I | 790 | <.01 | -29 | 0.06 | -7.19 | L putamen | | | |
| 2 | 108 | 0.01 | 30.5 | -5.1 | -10.9 | R putamen | | | |
| 3 | 89 | 0.01 | -38.5 | 21.8 | 11.7 | L inferior frontal gyrus | | | |
| Negative Associations | | | | | | | | | |
| I | 1223 | 0.02 | 27.4 | -75.1 | 43.6 | R lateral occipital cortex | | | |
| 2 | 332 | 0.04 | -23.5 | -75.9 | 47 | L lateral occipital cortex | | | |
| 3 | 21 | 0.05 | 57.7 | -59.6 | -16.2 | L Inferior temporal gyrus | | | |
| 4 | 14 | 0.03 | 35 | -49 | 67.9 | R superior parietal lobule | | | |

Supplementary Table 3. Clusters showing significant associations with lesions in the literature cohort

COG = centre of gravity, L = left, R = right



Supplementary Fig. 1 Lesion maps of the clinical cohort. (A) Lesions causing acquired neurogenic stuttering (N = 20), (B) Lesions of the control group matched for occurrence of speech-language problems following stroke (N = 17). See Supplementary Table 2 for additional information.

| Cluster Index | Voxels (N) | P Value | COG X (mm) | COG Y (mm) | COG Z (mm) | COG region | | | | |
|-----------------------|------------|---------|------------|------------|------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Positive Associations | | | | | | | | | | |
| I | 1247 | 0.02 | -31.3 | -7.17 | -6.51 | L putamen | | | | |
| 2 | 114 | 0.03 | 31.9 | -0.69 | -15.6 | R amygdala | | | | |
| 3 | 90 | 0.02 | -6.4 | -19.5 | -36.6 | L brainstem | | | | |
| 4 | 69 | 0.04 | 39.7 | -22.9 | 2.95 | R Heschl's gyrus | | | | |
| 5 | 53 | 0.01 | -26.4 | -1.24 | -36.9 | L parahippocampal gyrus/temporal fusiform cortex | | | | |
| 6 | 32 | 0.03 | -11.4 | -21.5 | -1.45 | L thalamus | | | | |
| 7 | 15 | 0.04 | -14 | -58.8 | -24 | L cerebellum | | | | |

Supplementary Table 4. Clusters showing significant associations with lesions in the clinical cohort

COG = centre of gravity, L = left, R = right

| Cluster Index | Voxels (N) | P Value | COG X (mm) | COG Y (mm) | COG Z (mm) | COG region |
|---------------|------------|---------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| I | 405 | <0.01 | -30 | -5.15 | -7.78 | L putamen |
| 2 | 22 | <0.01 | 28.2 | -4.18 | -11.9 | R amygdala |

Supplementary Table 5. Common acquired stuttering hub, with clusters representing overlap of specificity data across the literature and clinical cohorts

COG = centre of gravity, L = left, R = right



Supplementary Fig. 2 Lesion network overlap at different thresholds. Lesion network maps of the 20 cases were overlaid for each cohort, and thresholded at \geq 80% overlap (left) and \geq 90% overlap (right) to show regions connected to most of the lesion locations (i.e., regions sensitive to stuttering in the literature and clinical cohorts). Green circles used to highlight small clusters.



Supplementary Fig. 3 Confirmatory analyses with different lesion network overlap thresholds (80% on left, 90% on right). (A) Specificity analyses in the literature and clinical cohorts (whole brain PFWE<0.05), followed by conjunction analyses using the 80% or 90% threshold for both groups (see Supplementary Fig. 2) to show areas both sensitive and specific for stuttering in each of the cohorts. Positive associations are shown in red-yellow, negative in blue-light blue. Green circles used to highlight small clusters. (B) Common acquired stuttering networks using the 80% (left) or 90% (right) threshold, showing common areas that were sensitive and specific across both neurogenic stuttering cohorts. (C) Regression analyses within the identified common acquired neurogenic stuttering networks (from B, shown as transparent red in C) showed that more negative experiences with stuttering (OASES scores) were associated with increased grey matter volume in participants with persistent developmental stuttering (P_{FWE}<0.05, shown in blue). ASt = amygdalostriatal transition area; Cl = claustrum; Pu = putamen.

Α